NATIONAL SCHOOLS

FOR

MANITOBA.

"That the school system of Manitoba is accomplishing much less than a national system should, is no cause for surprise. Evidently with those who legislated it into existence, the *bona fide* education of the people was a consideration secondary to making the public schools nurseries for the Roman Catholic Church."

—Mr. W. F. Luxton to the Electors of Rockwood in November 1874.

WINNIPEG

1892.

[Wade, F.C.]
P 918

The School Question

IN MANITOBA.

"That the school system of Manitoba is accomplishing much less than a national system should, is no cause for surprise. Evidently with those who legislated it into existence, the *bona fide* education of the people was a consideration secondary to making the public schools nurseries for the Roman Catholic Church."—*Mr. W. F. Luxton to the Electors of Rockwood in November 1874.*

I.

Before Manitoba became a portion of the Dominion there were no school laws within its boundaries, and no public schools. Several schools were carried on by the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Presbyterian bodies, but they were private enterprises supported by fees and out of church funds. The schools of the various denominations were as distinct from one another as private institutions always are. After the union a public school system was created by which this separation was kept up so far as Roman Catholics were concerned, while all the other classes of the community became united. A Board of Education was created consisting of two sections, one Protestant and the other Roman Catholic, with two superintendents, and two sets of machinery for the management of the schools, and each section was given absolute control over its own schools. While the Roman Catholic section of the Board was properly so called, the other section including as it did, not only all other denominations, but the public at large, should have been called public or national rather than Protestant. From the time that the two sections undertook their respective duties, undenominational religious exercises were carried on in the schools of the Protestant section, and sectarianism and doctrinal teaching were carefully avoided. The Roman Catholics, on the contrary, condemned undenominational religious exercises and

insisted on teaching the special doctrines of their church with the utmost zeal.

"Nurseries for the Roman Catholic Church."

The Archbishop of St. Boniface was placed at the head of the Roman Catholic section, and with him were always enough priests to control the vote. The schools were taught by the Reverend Sisters of Charity, the Reverend Sisters of Jesus and Mary, the Faithful Companions of Jesus, the Reverend Maristes Brothers, the parish priests, and other devout Roman Catholics. The inspectors consisted of priests solely. Religious instruction, in one form or another, formed a large portion of the school work. Vocal music, for instance, in the second division consisted of songs and hymns; in the third, church chants; in the fourth, plain chants; in the fifth, hymns and psalms; and in the sixth, anthems. History in the second, third and fourth divisions was confined to the Old and New Testaments, and in the fifth to Canada under the French regime. British Canadian history could not be learned until the sixth division was reached, and English history was reserved for the seventh. As very few French pupils reached these divisions, British Canadian History and institutions and English history remained unknown to the mass of children in the Roman Catholic schools. Those who knew anything of them gained their knowledge through authors friendly neither to England nor to British institutions in Canada. A third division of the programme of studies consisted of "bienseance" or decorum, under which pupils were taught among other things how to address a letter to a prelate or a priest, how to terminate such letters, what titles to employ in conversation in addressing such persons, how to behave in a holy place, order of precedence, the titles of dignitaries, and so forth. A fourth division of the programme consisted of religious instruction, in Butler's catechism, the creed, the sacraments; in the fourth division the commandments and "the unseen part of the catechism," and in the highest divisions, the catechism of perseverance; while the choice by the Catholic section of books on religious and moral matters could be overriden by the Arch-

bishop. Besides all this, the inspectors, who were priests, were required by the regulations of the Catholic section to report whether there was "a crucifix or some religious image" in each school visited. Archbishop Tache contends that the school is the children's church. It will be seen by the foregoing facts, which can all be found in the reports of the Catholic section, that they were churches indeed, even to the extent of crucifixes and religious images.

Romanizing the Schools.

The following are a few instances of the questions set Roman Catholic candidates for teachers certificates in 1885 :

"What is the Church ? Where is the true Church ? Ought we to believe what the Catholic Church teaches us ? And why ?"

"What is the mass ? What must be done to properly understand it ?"

"What sentiments ought we to entertain towards our Guardian Angel ?"

"What are the principal mysteries of our religion ?"

"Describe the fall (*a*) of the angels (*b*) of the first man."

"What is meant by indulgences ? What must be done in order to obtain them ?"

Is it any wonder that the Roman Catholic church should desire to perpetuate a system, which however little it may benefit education, does more than anything else can do in inculcating, not necessarily morality, but certainly Roman Catholicism, pure and simple, with all its creeds, formularies and observances; which teaches not only that the Roman Catholic church is the true church, but that all others are false and damnable.

It was this sort of thing which the present Government determined to eradicate from the public school system. It was found that while the Roman Catholics insisted upon remaining apart from the rest of the community and despised all other religions, they did not show a like

anxiety to keep aloof from the public chest. They managed so well in fact that while the Protestant school districts received but $197.55 each from the legislative grant, they received $347.03; while the Protestant teachers received $121.76 each, they got $195.05; while on the other hand the Protestant school districts taxed themselves $456.20 each, the Catholics taxed themselves only $277.95 per district; in fine, while the Protestants raised 70 cents for each dollar of the cost of their schools and got but 30 cents from the public chest, the Roman Catholics raised but 45 cents for each dollar of cost and got 55 cents out of the public monies—for the purpose of keeping up children's churches, and inculcating Roman Catholic dogmas with the assistance of crucifixes and religious images.

The School Act, 1890—National Schools.

By the Public School Act of 1890, all this was changed. The Board of Education was succeeded by the Department of Education and the Advisory Board. The separation of Protestants and Roman Catholics was done away with. It was provided that the religious exercises in the public schools should no longer be sectarian, that they should take place just before the closing hour in the afternoon and should be conducted according to the regulations of the Advisory Board, and further that no child shall be allowed to attend the religious exercises if his or her parent or guardian is unwilling. The regulations as to religious exercises adopted by the Advisory Board require the reading, without note or comment, of any one of a large number of prescribed selections from either the authorized English version of the Bible or from the Catholic version, and the use of the Lord's prayer and another simple form of prayer which is also prescribed. It was considered that while religious exercises of so simple a kind could be objectionable to no sect nor individual they would at the same time fully subserve the purpose for which they were intended, that of keeping up religious observances in the schools, while at the same time preventing our public schools from being used for the inculcation and diffusion of sectarian doctrines and dogmas. In the taxation of property for public purposes, and in the distri-

bution of the taxes and of the legislative grant denominational distinctions are no longer recognized, but all are treated alike. In a word, since the 31st of March, 1890, we have had national schools established in Manitoba, and it is to these national schools, so acceptable to all other citizens of the Province almost without exception, that the Roman Catholics so strenuously object.

The List of Objections.

The objections which have been advanced so far may be classified as follows :

1. The Roman Catholics were guaranteed separate schools by law in the Manitoba Act.

2. The Roman Catholic settlers of Red River were guaranteed separate schools by treaty previous to the union with Canada.

3. It is a matter of conscience with Roman Catholics to insist upon having separate schools, because—

4. National schools, where Roman Catholic creeds are not taught, are 'Godless,' and lead to immorality and crime.

5. National schools cannot exist if the hierarchy is opposed to them, and it has been decreed that the national schools of Manitoba must go.

II.

Are National Schools Possible?

Consider the last objection first.

A few who are forced to concede that national undenominational schools are in the interest of the Province, but are loth to give the Government credit for any of its measures, condemn a national school system as being impracticable. It is impossible, they say, to oppose the wishes of the Roman Catholic Church. It is useless to run counter to the desires of so great and so powerful an organization. Undenominational schools may be established, but they must, they say, soon succumb to the vigilant and ever active opposition of the hierarchy. They advise us to give up the fight at the outset, and acknowledge that the state is beaten, that what the priesthood demands no one dare deny. They say that if the Church desires sectarian teaching in schools supported either wholly or in part by public money, the Church will have it, let public opinion be what it will. The best answer to this kind of argument is experience. Take then, first—

The Experience of other Countries.

Switzerland.

In Switzerland some cantons are almost exclusively Catholic, while in others Protestants constitute the large majority. Care is taken that there is no compulsion to attend religious services and no interference with liberty of conscience. The exercises consist in hymns, prayers, and reading the Bible, generally without comment. Sectarian education in the sense in which the Roman Catholics demand it is not found to be necessary.

Belgium.

While the Liberals of Belgium favor purely secular schools, the Conservatives have always strongly contended for denominational teaching. In the large centres of industry, despite the interference of the clergy and the strife

of political parties, instruction continues to be secular. This is the case notwithstanding that "The Roman Catholic religion is professed by nearly the entire population of Belgium." (Statesman's Year Book 1891, p. 374.)

Italy.

In Italy "the priesthood claims to direct the education of the masses, but the changes which have taken place in the temporal rule have greatly restricted their influence. Speaking generally, religious instruction is only imparted once a week by laymen, and only to those children whose parents desire it. It does not form part of the national system, and, as in other Catholic countries, the clergy are bitterly opposed to education by the state as at present regulated." ("Subjects of the Day," May, 1890, p. 75.)

France.

"In France the struggle for priestly ascendancy has exercised greater influence over State instruction than in any other European country, and entirely to the disadvantage of the clergy. The department of education professes complete neutrality towards the religious denominations, but it is by exclusion and not by the concurrent endorsement of education. Hence the State system, which is purely secular, is usually designated "Godless education," and it is no doubt one of the results of the reaction against priestly interference in other than religious affairs." —(Ibid.)

Ireland.

Under the National School system of Ireland Roman Catholics and Protestants are educated together. The conscience clause provides that when "once the religion of a child is entered on the register, the teacher, if of a different religious persuasion, must not permit the child, unless under the written authority of the parent on a certificate duly witnessed, to remain in attendance whilst religious instruction was proceeding." Bishop Doyle, the vehement advocate of Catholic schools, felt compelled to say: "I

cannot refrain from expressing the ardent desire I feel of having the children of all Irishmen without distinction united in schools and in every relation of life." The Pope, though at first opposed to the system, finally called upon his Bishops to thank the Government "for giving so much of its wealth to the poor children of the country."—(Ibid. p. 59.)

Australia.

"The Australian colonies are essentially democratic, and so, like the United States, they all base their common school systems on the principles of religious freedom, and the non-establishment of any particular form of religious belief."—Ibid. p. 109.

The United States.

E. E. White, LL.D., Superintendent of Public Schools of Cincinnati, in a paper read before the National Educational Association in Topeka, Kansas, July 15, 1886, says, (p. 10): "The great majority of American schools are religious without being sectarian; and it is high time that this fact were more universally recognized. It is doubtless true that the most impressive forms of presenting religious sanctions to the mind and heart of the young are prayer, silent or spoken, and the reverent reading of the Bible, especially those portions of the present human duty in its relations to the Divine Will—forms still permitted and widely used in four-fifths of the American schools."—(Papers of the American Historical Association, Vol. 2, No. 4, p. 457.)

The Experience of the Canadian Provinces.

New Brunswick.

In the Province of New Brunswick the school system is purely national, and non-sectarian. Regulation 21 of the Board of Education provides that: It shall be the privilege of every teacher to open and close the daily exercises of the school by reading a portion of Scripture

(out of the common or Douay version, as he may prefer), and by offering the Lord's Prayer. Any other prayer may be used by permission of the Board of Trustees. But no teacher shall compel any pupil to be present at these exercises against the wish of his parent or guardian expressed in writing to the Board of Trustees. The national non-sectarian system has been in existence in New Brunswick for more than twenty years, and there is not the slightest probability that it will be interfered with.

Nova Scotia.

Sectarian public schools are unknown in Nova Scotia. George Iles, of New York, in an article on "The Separate School System of Canada," in "Education," a Boston publication, in June, 1890, said "In Nova Scotia one-fourth of the inhabitants are Catholics; public sentiment has always sternly opposed a separate school system, and the Church of Rome has never seriously thrown herself into the attempt to plant it there."

Prince Edward Island.

Referring to the improvement of the national school law in New Brunswick, Archbishop Tache, in a pamphlet on the school question published in 1877, wrote, "all these hardships imposed upon the Catholics of New Brunswick are said by some to be nothing but 'fair play,' 'equal rights,' etc., so the good people of Prince Edward Island thought they could do no better than follow such examples. Out of a population of 94,021, Catholics number 40,442. The Non-Catholics took advantage of the small difference in numbers, the whole Island was agitated on the school question, fanaticism was aroused, war declared against Catholic schools, and as one and one-third are more than one the 'non-sectarian system' prevailed." Another way of putting this would be by saying that the people of Prince Edward Island were determined to secure national schools, and succeeded in realizing their wish.

British Columbia.

Like the provinces in the east the province in the extreme west is favored with national unsectarian schools. Section 62 of Chapter 40 of the "Public School Act, 1891," provides as follows: "All Public Schools established under the provisions of this Act shall be conducted on strictly secular and non-sectarian principles. The highest morality shall be inculcated, but no religious dogma nor creed shall be taught. The Lord's Prayer may be used in opening or closing the school."

Could any greater proof be required that national schools are possible, and that there is no necessity to bow to the Roman Catholic demand for sectarian education. The experiences of Switzerland, Belgium, and Italy, of France and Ireland, of Australia and the United States of America, and of nearly all the Provinces of Canada, go to show that sectarian instruction is not necessary, and that non-sectarian schools are not only possible but in every way successful and satisfactory.

III.

Are National Schools Godless?

Take next the second to last objection. It has long been the fashion of Roman Catholics to stigmatize the public schools of the United States as 'godless' institutions, and the same charge has been foolishly preferred against the national school system now in vogue in this province. It is an old cry, and one that soon becomes discredited wherever national schools are put to the test. In four-fifths of the schools of the United States, national schools of a non-sectarian character, religious exercises are made use of as in the so-called 'godless' schools of Manitoba and yet the progress of the United States in religion is the marvel of modern times. It has been estimated that there are in the United States 132,434 churches with 91,911 ministers of the Gospel and 19,018,917 communicants. Church property, it is said, doubles in value every decade. While in large cities on the continent there are large parishes of 50,000 persons with a single pastor, in the United States there is on an average a pastor for every thousand members. While in Berlin there are but sixty churches for 1,200,000 souls, in New York there are three hundred churches for about the same population. A comparison of the religious statistics of American cities with those of most other continental cities must serve to show that under the so-called 'Godless' school system of the United States religion has flourished as it never flourished in the world before.

Some Interesting Criminal Statistics.

The converse of the Roman Catholic claim is that the schools of that church are godly and in every way productive of morality. Will this claim stand the test? A glance at the Dominion criminal statistics for the year ending September 30th, 1890, shows the following convictions for indictable offences :—Class I. Offences against the person, Baptists, 23; Roman Catholics, 437; Church of England, 143; Methodists, 81; Presbyterians, 68; Protestants, 54; other denominations, 23. Class II. Offences against

property with violence—Baptists, 7; Roman Catholics, 140; Church of England, 51; Methodists, 30; Presbyterians, 23; and so on. Class III. Offences against property, without violence—Baptists, 62; Roman Catholics, 1194; Church of England, 406; Methodists, 272; Presbyterians, 153; and so on. Taking the total of convictions for indictable offences for the year we find them classified as follows:—Roman Catholics, 1896; all other denominations taken together, 1760. The Roman Catholics, though not more than two-fifths of the population, were responsible for more than half the crime.

Foreign Criminal Statistics.

According to the Almanico Populare of Turin, there is in England one murder in 178,000 people; in Catholic Spain, one in 4,113; in the Roman States, one in 780; or 237 times as many murders in the Catholic Roman States as in England in proportion to population. In his "Speeches of Pope Pius IX.," at page 24, Mr. Gladstone points out that there was more Roman crime during the last two years of the papal rule than in the two years following.

Statistics of Criminal Immorality.

In the Almanico Populare of Turin, again, it is stated that the legitimate children in London number $24\frac{3}{4}$ to one illegitimate; in Vienna, one legitimate to $1\frac{1}{6}$ illegitimate; in Rome, one legitimate to $2\frac{2}{3}$ illegitimate. Rome, therefore, the very centre of priestly influence, is as regards illegitimacy, sixty-six times worse than London. Anything more amazing than this to the people of the United States, whose national schools are stigmatized as "godless" because they do not allow instruction in the Roman Catholic creed, could not well be imagined. If the lack of instruction in the tenets of the Roman Catholic faith is "godlessness," and leads to immorality, it is strange that immorality and crime are so prevalent in countries where there is a superabundance of Roman Catholic influences.

Prof. Schaff on National Schools in the United States.

The venerable American historian, Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., in his "Church and State in the United States," says of the so-called "godless" system of the United States "the State recognizes the importance of religion by allowing the reading of the Bible, the singing of a hymn, and the recital of the Lord's Prayer, or some other prayer, as opening exercises of the school. I am informed by competent authority, that at least four-fifths of the public schools in the United States observe this custom. Most of the school teachers, especially the ladies, are members of Evangelical churches, and commend religion by their spirit and example. To call such schools "Godless" is simply a slander."

The Board Schools of England.

Corresponding to our national and unsectarian schools are the Board schools of England. One third of the elementary education in England is supplied by Board schools, and the rest by voluntary schools. In a Board school "no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught," and in "Subjects of the Day," for May, 1890, Edward M. Hance, LL.B., Clerk of the Liverpool School Board writes :— "How far the Board schools, as a whole, are from being justly open to the charge of giving 'Godless' education may be gathered from the following extract from the report of the late Royal Commission on Education, (page 113,) viz : "We find that out of 2,225 School Boards, representing the judgment of more than sixteen millions of our population only seven in England and fifty in Wales, according to the parliamentary returns of 1879, 1884 and 1886, have dispensed entirely with religious teaching or observances." The small Boards which shut out direct religious teaching from their day schools is, it is pointed out, in the most part in Wales where the Sunday School system powerfully affects the whole population.

The Hon. Edward Blake and the National Schools of Ontario.

Probably the most conclusive reply to the cry of "Godless" schools is the fact that in the Public Schools of Ontario, where the religious exercises are the same as in Manitoba, 50,000 Roman Catholic children, two-thirds of the Roman Catholic children of Ontario, are being educated in the National Public Schools. In his celebrated speech on "Provincial Issues—The Religious Cry," at Hamilton, during the local campaign of 1886, the Hon. Edward Blake pointed out that Principal Caven, the head of the Knox Presbyterian Theological College, Provost Body, the head of Trinity University, one of the Theological Colleges of the Church of England, Principal Nelles, the head of Victoria, the Methodist University, and Principal Castle, the head of the Baptist College, had agreed upon the form of undenominational religious exercises in the Ontario public schools, of which the religious exercises in the public schools of Manitoba are practically a copy. "The churches" said Mr. Blake, "approached each other; they agreed to co-operate with each other, and I thanked God for it. I thanked God for it because I thought it was an indication that we were beginning to sink, in some degree, our sectarianism, and to realize our points of agreement; to recognize more and more how much there was that we all held together of the fundamental common truths of christianity. I thanked God for it because I thought it pointed to a broader, more generous, more Christian feeling, which boded great good for the church, and for the world." He further drew attention to the fact that the late Archbishop Lynch, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Ontario, did not object to the introduction of these undenominational religious exercises into the public schools of Ontario, although it was at those schools that two-thirds of the Roman Catholic children of the Province received their education.

IV.

A Matter of Conscience.

Take next the third objection. The Roman Catholic citizen states that his conscience requires him to insist upon doctrinal teaching in the public schools, and inveighs loudly against any interference with what he calls his liberty of conscience. His objection is not that under a national school training his child will be taught anything offensive, but that too little attention will be given to his religious education in the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. His persecution consists in this that he is not allowed to engraft sectarian instruction upon the public school system. He blames the law not because it requires him to do something that clashes with his conscience, but because it will not do all that his so-called convictions require. This claim is not a question of conscience but a question of special privilege. If this is religious persecution the definition of the offence universally accepted will require very radical revision.

The Roman Catholic Conscience—What is it?

When the Roman Catholic loudly declaims against his conscientious convictions being interfered with, he cannot object to stating what religious convictions his church allows him as an individual to entertain. In "The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance," the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, without "citing any of the fearfully energetic epithets in which the condemnations are sometimes clothed," mentions a few of the propositions, "the holders of which have been condemned by the See of Rome during" the twelve or fifteen years previous to 1874. The following have been condemned :—

1. Those who maintain the liberty of the press. Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI, in 1831; and of Pope Pius IX, in 1864.

2. Or the *liberty of conscience* or of worship. Encyclical of Pius IX, December 8, 1864.

3. Or the liberty of speech. "Syllabus" of March 18, 1861, Prop. lxxix. Encyclical of Pope Pius IX, December 8, 1864.

4. Or that in conflict of laws, civil and ecclesiastical, the civil law should prevail. "Syllabus," Prop. xlii.

5. Or that any method of instruction of youth, solely secular, may be approved. Ibid, Prop. xlviii.

6. Or that any other religion than the Roman Catholic Religion may be established by a state. Ibid, Prop. lxxvii.

7. Or that in "countries called Catholic" the free exercise of other religions may laudibly be allowed. Ibid, Prop. lxxviii.

The above are but seven instances out of eighteen given by Mr. Gladstone, whose list is but a partial one. In the face of these facts the claim of the Roman Catholic to liberty of conscience as an individual seems based upon little or no foundation. The Church in whose name he so loudly demands liberty of conscience has strongly condemned liberty of speech, liberty of the press, liberty of worship, and the very liberty of conscience which he demands. If the Roman Catholic is deprived of liberty of conscience his quarrel is with his Church which deprives him of so much, and not with this Province in which he is absolutely free.

A Priest-made Conscience.

There is no use blinking the facts, and if the Roman Catholic citizen is candid he will admit that his quarrel with national schools arises from no conscientious convictions as an individual, but from the attitude taken by his Church. Dr. Ryerson, who was Chief Superintendent of Education of Upper Canada and Ontario from 1844 to 1876, plainly perceived this state of facts, and thus explained the position in one of his writings before Confederation :

"Separate school education is now a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, as much as the immaculate conception is. In 1850 the Roman Catholic College of Thurles,

in Ireland, passed a statute condemnatory of mixed education; the Roman Catholic Provincial Colleges of Baltimore and Quebec have since done the same. These statutes have been ratified by the Pope. This is therefore the dogma of the Church, however much it may fall into disuse in some places, as Sir Thomas N. Redington says it does in some places in Ireland."

The fight for national schools, then, is not with the Roman Catholic as an individual, but with the Roman Catholic Chnrch and its arrogant claim, as stated by Mr. Gladstone, that in the conflict of laws, civil and ecclesiastical, the ecclesiastical commands must prevail.

Stimulating the Roman Catholic Conscience.

It is only natural that "convictions" thus imposed ready-made upon the adherents of the Roman Catholic church, and not necessarily springing from the source of conscience, should require a good deal of stimulus from time to time. In January, 1871, for instance, the Roman Catholic Bishop of London, Ontario, felt constrained to conclude his pastoral letter by ordaining in the name of God that "no Catholic parent living within the legal limits of a separate school, shall send his children to mixed or common schools, they being adjudged by the Canadian hierarchy as dangerous to faith and morals. Should any Catholic parent unfortunately persist in violating this ordinance, he shall be refused the Holy Sacraments until such time as they shall consent to obey the church in this matter." Archbishop Cleary's brimstone utterances two years ago have not yet disappeared from the public mind. In the pastoral letter of the archbishops and bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa, in April, 1891, the clergy, secular and regular, and the faithful of the provinces were reminded "of the true doctrine concerning the control of the church over the education of the Catholic children in schools," and told that in Manitoba "they are trying once more an underhand and satanic prosecution against the rights of the church," that the Archbishop of St. Boniface has raised his voice against "this iniquity," has made known the

"perfidious stratagem," and has allowed his flock to "see how odious it is." This shows that the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Canada is not far behind that of the United States in appealing to the adherents of the church to vindicate their "liberty of conscience," and put down the public school system. If they keep on we may hope to see the Canadian Roman Catholic conscience stimulated by words like these of priest Phelan, uttered at a St. Louis convention on October 17th, 1873:

"The children of the public schools turn out to be learned horse thieves, scholastic counterfeiters. The Catholics would as soon send their children into a pest house or bury them, as let them go to public schools. They were afraid the child who left home in the morning, would come back with something in his heart as black as hell."

Similarly Bishop Baltes, of Alton, in his Lenten pastoral of 1870, calls the public schools "seminaries of infidelity and fruitful sources of immorality." Thus it is that frenzied invective and the refusal of the Sacrament are brought into play to compel the Roman Catholic individual to entertain the "conscientious convictions" with which otherwise he would have but little sympathy.

Church and State.

It will be easily seen then, that the question is whether the church or state is to control in matters of education. Mr. Gladstone long ago clearly perceived this. "All other christian bodies," he said, "are content with freedom in their own religious domain; Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Nonconformists, one and all in the present day, contentedly and thankfully accept the benefits of civil order; never pretend that the state is not its own master; make no religious claims to temporal possessions or advantages; and consequently, never are in perilous collision with the state. Nay more, even so, I believe it is with mass of Roman Catholics individually. But not so with the leaders of their church, or with those who take pride in following the leaders."

Does the fact that the Roman Catholic church has decreed that its doctrines must be taught as a part of our

public school system necessitate our teaching them there? Must the state impose doctrinal teaching upon the public school system because the Roman Catholic church has so commanded it, and its adherents dare not disobey? If so, what can the church command that the state must not obey, and where is the boasted supremacy of the state over the church in matters of civil concern? The church, as such, it has been said, has nothing to do with the state but to obey its laws and to strengthen its moral foundations; the state has nothing to do with the church except to protect her in her property and liberty. These are the relations between church and state of which modern civilization has approved. Either they must continue to exist, or we must bow submissively to Pope Pius IX and his condemnation of all who assign to the state the power of defining the civil rights and province of the church.

Individual Conscience and the Law.

But even if it were a matter of conscientious conviction with the Roman Catholic that he should be allowed to inculcate his religious doctrines to the fullest extent through the medium of the public schools, must these convictions take form in our educational system? In 1878 the United States Supreme Court was required to decide what is meant by religious liberty under the American constitution. Reynolds, a Mormon, charged with bigamy, sought to defend himself by proving that he was a Mormon and "that the members of the church believe that the practice of polygamy was directly enjoined upon the male members thereof by Almighty God, in a revelation to Joseph Smith, the founder and prophet of said church," and that disobediance would be punished by "damnation in the life to come." A stronger case of religious conviction could not probably be adduced, and yet Chief Justice Waite, while admitting this, delivered judgment in the Supreme Court as follows:

"Laws are made for the government of actions, and while they cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices. Suppose one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious

worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent sacrifice. Or, if a wife religiously believed that it was her duty to burn herself upon the funeral pile of her dead husband, would it be beyond the power of the civil government to prevent her carrying her belief into practice? So here, as a law of the organization of society under the exclusive dominion of the United States, it is provided that plural marriages shall not be allowed. Can a man excuse his practices to the contrary because of his religious belief? To permit this would be to make the profound doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land, and in effect to permit every citizen to become a law unto himself. Government would exist only in name under such circumstances."

The instance given fully illustrates the principles upon which the modern state is formed, and to which its success is largely due.

Face the Real Facts.

The conscience plea cannot bear examination. The fact is that the Roman Catholic Church, which is probably the richest, the most powerful, and the most determined in the world, long ago concluded to teach its doctrines in the public schools, for the double purpose of spreading Roman Catholic doctrines and preventing Roman Catholics from drifting into Protestantism, or becoming indifferent to the hierarchy and their doctrines. For this reason the so-called conscience plea was made a dogma of the church, so that it might be enforced upon its flock by a free use of all the terrors of anathema and excommunication. That conscience is in no way concerned is clearly shown by the elasticity it manifests wherever the priesthood finds it difficult to enforce its so-called dictates, as in the United States, Australia, and the many other countries already mentioned.

V.

The Alleged Treaty Rights to Separate Schools.

The second objection may next be dealt with. In a letter in the *Free Press* Archbishop Tache stated that his object was "to show that the rights claimed by the Catholics of Manitoba are not merely the result of an Act passed in parliament, but an integral part of an agreement or treaty made between the Dominion of Canada and the Settlers of Red River, previous to the entry of our Province into confederation." To establish this statement he set out in his letter a bill of rights, clause 7 of which contained the following demand :—

"7. That the schools be separate, and that the public money for schools be distributed among the different religious denominations, in proportion to their respective populations, according to the system of the Province of Quebec."

To say that this statemeut caused surprise to those most familiar with the history of the country in 1869-70 is to give but a faint idea of the amazement that followed. On the 9th of January following Mr. James Taylor, who was in possession of the records of the Provisional Government, replied to the Archbishop through the columns of the *Free Press*, expressing his great surprise because of the statement made, and others followed in the same strain. Evidently the Archbishop himself felt that his announcement would be news to the people of Red River, as in appending the bill of rights to his letter he apologized for it by saying "the document is rather long, but as it has *never been published before* it may prove interesting to many as an historical document."

It is not necessary to answer at length the claim that separate schools were provided for by the Manitoba Act because "the settlers of Red River" asked for them. According to Archbishop Tache's own statement the bills of right drawn up by the settlers at their convention had nothing to do with the negotiations at Ottawa.

"There were two bills of rights, he says, framed and agreed upon in public meetings, one in November, 1869, and

the other in January and February, 1870. Every one acknowledges that the first was not acted upon: the second was presented to Mr. Donald A. Smith, was attached by himself to his own report, but was never handed to the delegates to be carried to Ottawa."

Even if these bills of rights had been forwarded with the delegates to Ottawa neither of them contained the slightest reference to separate schools. So much for the treaty with "the settlers" of Red River.

When the delegates went to Ottawa, they were furnished with credentials and the list of rights ostensibly in the main as adopted by the convention on the third of February. This is what is called the third bill of rights, and is like the two former bills in containing no reference to separate schools, no treaty with "the settlers of Red River."

Tampering and Duplicity in 1870.

But mark how the treaty with the "settlers" came into existence! "I will now give you some reasons," writes Archbishop Tache, in his letter to Mr. Taylor, of Jan. 13th, 1870, printed in the *Free Press*, "to believe that my bill was the one taken to Ottawa. I saw myself the document handed over to Rev. Mr. Ritchot and Judge Black by the officials of the provisional government. I had heard some of the objections made by them to certain articles in the first essay, and I saw some modifications made in my presence by the said officials."

A comparison of the original list of rights in the handwriting of Thomas Bunn, the late secretary of the provisional government, with that published by Archbishop Tache for the first time, shows that the Tache bill differs materially from the other one in two clauses, in one of which a form of government which includes a senate is asked for, and in the other separate schools are demanded. And how were these two important constitutional demands made by "the settlers of Red River"? "I saw some modifications made in my presence," by the "officials" of the provisional government! Who were the "officials," and how was it that "my presence" happened to be so

opportune? Just what "my presence" had to do with the insertion of this demand for separate schools, a demand which the people themselves never seemed to dream of making, the prelate of St. Boniface may some day explain. In the meantime anything so farcical as the pretence that an interpolation of this kind expressed the will of the people of Red River could not well be imagined. Who will hesitate to say that a clause so introduced into a bill of rights, instead of being dignified as a treaty obligation, should be condemned as an outrageous violation of the rights of the parties concerned? Does it not follow that any provision in the Manitoba Act based upon this interpolation and looking to separate schools should be regarded as a fraud upon the citzens of this country, present and future, as well as upon those "settlers of Red River," who did not know until nineteen years after the bill of rights had undergone "modifications," that in 1870 they pressed the Dominion Government to grant them separate schools?

An Explanation that does not Explain. The Archbishop's Confession.

Not only does the Archbishop's explanation discredit his cause, but it fails to assist him in his interpretation of the Manitoba Act. If the Dominion Government wished to agree to a demand "that the schools be separate," and that the public money for educational purposes be distributed among them "according to the system of the Province of Quebec," what could have been easier than to so state the intention in the Manitoba Act? Why should not the very words of clause 7 of Riel's bill of rights have been reproduced in the Manitoba Act? Instead of that, section 22 of that Act simply provides as follows:

"In and for the said Province the said Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:—(1) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the Province at the Union." These are identical with the corresponding

words of the British North America Act, except that the words "or practice" are omitted from the sub-section of that Act. Why did the Dominion Parliament refuse to insert a plain provision that the schools should be separate and that the monies should be distributed on the Quebec system, and instead of that, merely introduce the words "or practice"? Either some one desired to hoodwink Parliament by the insertion of these two words, innocent looking enough in themselves, or Parliament itself was unwilling to enact in so many words that a system of separate Roman Catholic schools should exist in Manitoba, or which is not impossible, section 22 was passed without any reference to the seventh clause of what may be called the Riel-Tache bill of rights. Speaking of the second bill of rights, prepared by the "Convention of Forty," Archbishop Tache himself says, in a letter in reply to Mr. Taylor, "I know perfectly well that the general impression was that this last bill of rights was the one given to the delegates to be used at Ottawa. Lord Dufferin himself was under that impression." In a despatch of December 10, 1874, Lord Dufferin expressed his views on this question forcibly enough. "An attempt," he said, "has been made to show that these delegates really held their appointment from Reil, and are to be considered as commissioned by his government. This, however, was not so; they were selected and the terms they were instructed to demand were settled before the election of Riel to the presidency." It might be gathered from Archbishop Tache's statement—that the second bill of rights, though appended by Donald A. Smith to his report, was not handed to the delegates—that it could not have been the report which the Government at Ottawa considered. Lord Dufferin says it was the one considered. Archbishop Tache himself was at one time a pretty good authority to the same effect. In his evidence on page 20 of Appendix 6 of the House of Commons Journals, 1874, he stated as follows:

"When I reached St. Paul I received intelligene of the Convention at Fort Garry," (the Convention of Forty) "and I telegraphed to Mr. Howe asking if they had heard

of the Bill of Rights. He replied by telegram dated 23rd Feb., 1870, as follows:

To the Right Rev. Bishop Tache:

"Bill of rights not yet received here; will telegraph and write you when I get it."

(Signed) Jos. Howe."

"I then telegraphed the Bill of Rights to Mr. Howe. I received in reply the telegram of 25th Feb., 1870, as follows:

Ottawa, Feb. 25, 1870.

To Bishop Tache, St. Paul:

Proposition in the main satisfactory, but let the delegates come here to settle details."

(Signed) Joseph Howe."

This statement of the Archbishop proves several very important facts. First, the bill of rights of "the settlers of Red River," passed by the "Convention of Forty," was sent to the Government at Ottawa. Second, it was sent by the prelate of St. Boniface himself. Third, it was considered and approved by the Government. Fourth, the delegates were invited to Ottawa to settle "the details" only. Fifth, there was nothing in any of its propositions either directly or remotely referring to separate schools or the Quebec system of distributing school monies. In his letter to Archbishop Tache in January, 1890, Mr. James Taylor concluded with this rather pertinent remark:—"Your Grace is aware that in the administration of our affairs, while there has been a great deal of diplomacy there has also been a good deal of duplicity."

VI.

The Legal Question.

So much for the backstairs methods, and the diplomacy and duplicity of 1869 and 1870. Consider lastly the first objection on the list. What tampering and interpolation had to do with the changed aspect of the bill of rights after it left the hands of the people, and with the Manitoba Act itself, is one question ; what is meant by the words "or practice," contained in section twenty-two of that Act, is another. That section provides that in and for the Province of Manitoba the legislature "may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provision :—(1) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice at the Union." It is admitted on all sides that no denomination possessed any rights or privileges with respect to its schools by law at the time of the union, for the reason that there was no statute touching such schools in Manitoba at the union. Had any denomination then a right or privilege which the Public Schools Act of 1890 has prejudicially affected, and if so what was it? This is the question now before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, and it is a question of law which will be decided there in due course. In the meantime three of the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba have decided that the Roman Catholics possessed no right to denominational schools, which has been affected. The Hon. Mr. Justice Dubuc held a contrary opinion, and five of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Canada who heard the appeal have adopted his view. Considering both Courts together, six Judges have decided in favor of the Roman Catholic contention and three against it. Of the six who supported the Roman Catholic view, three—the Hon. Mr. Justice Dubuc in Manitoba, and two of the Judges of the Supreme Court—are French Roman Catholics. The English Judges, therefore, stood three against three, and the two English Judges who read judgments in the Supreme Court differed radically in their views, though arriving at the same conclusion.

What will the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council say? Canadians cannot boast that the judgments of the Supreme Court have hitherto attained dignity by being supported by the Privy Council in England. Disaster after disaster has attended them there. Mr. Mowat's long series of triumphs over the late Sir John Macdonald and the Supreme Court in the adjudication of constitutional questions is well known to every Canadian. In the escheats case (Mercer v. Attorney-General for Ontario), the streams bill case (McLaren v. Caldwell), the case in which British Columbia claimed the minerals in its public lands which had been transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway (Attorney-General of British Columbia v. Attorney-General of Canada), and the case relating to the taxation of lands (Lawless v. Sullivan) the judgments of the Supreme Court were absolutely reversed. In the insurance cases (Citizen's Insurance Co. v. Parsons and Queen's Insurance Co. v. Parsons) their judgments were reversed on the merits, and in the liquor license case (In re Liquor License Act of 1883 and Act amending) the Judicial Committee upset a portion of the Supreme Court decision. The only decisions on purely constitutional law pronounced by the Supreme Court which have been upheld by the Judicial Committee are, one relating to indirect taxation by law stamps (Queen v. Doutre), and the improper claim made by the Dominion to lands in Ontario the Indian title to which had been surrendered (St. Catharine's Milling Co. v. The Queen). That the Judges of the Supreme Court have decided against the Judges of Manitoba on a point of constitutional law is not disheartening when it is considered that out of nine of its judgments on constitutional questions seven have been reversed wholly or in part by the Court of last resort and only two have been sustained. Apart from the fact that the Manitoba judgments give evidence of much more thought and careful reasoning than those of the two English Judges who delivered judgments at Ottawa, (Hon. Mr. Justice Strong read no judgment and the Hon. Mr. Justice Gwynne did not sit on the case) the chances indicate a prompt reversal of the Ottawa decision.

VII.

The Necessity for National Schools.

All that has gone before has shown not only that separate schools are unnecessary, but that national schools should be retained at any cost. The arguments bearing out this contention were concisely stated when the Equal Rights party was formed in Ontario a few years ago to resist the aggression of the Romish church; in their address issued on March 1st, 1890, they assigned the following reasons for their opposition to separate rchools:—1. On the ground that that system apportions public money for sectarian purposes, in effect the same thing as supporting church and clergy by public taxation. 2. Separate schools injure the state by vigilantly keeping apart those who should grow up together in a common citizenship. 3. The faith of Catholic children is in no way tampered with in public schools; it being specially provided that if their parents so desire, they need not be present at prayers or Bible reading. 4. The Catholic schools are admitted to be inferior to the public schools, and from their smallness and fewness their inferiority is likely to continue, to public injury and loss. On the score of illiteracy alone priestly interference in education must ever be strenuously resisted. Where has illiteracy flourished most conspicuously in Canada, if not in Quebec? Where are the people unable to read and write in Manitoba to-day, if not in the French Roman Catholic parishes? And wherein is our experience in this respect different from that of the rest of the world? The following figures speak for themselves:

The Great Nurse of Ignorance.

The census of the United States for 1880 showed that out of its total population over ten years of age only 9.4 per cent. were unable to write. In Victoria, in 1881, 92½ per cent. of the population fifteen years of age and over could both read and write, and only 3½ per cent. were entirely illiterate. In England, during the year 1890, only 7.2 per cent. of the males and 8.3 per cent. of the females

signed by mark in the marriage registers. In Scotland only 4.30 per cent. of the males and 7.38 per cent. of the females signed by mark in the marriage registers in 1889. These are countries where Roman Catholicism and its methods of instruction are not in the ascendant. Turn but for a moment and glance at the illiteracy prevalent in countries where Roman Catholics are numerous and more or less nearly supreme. While in Scotland, in 1886, out of a total vote polled of 447,588, only 7,708 were illiterate, in Ireland, in the same year, out of a total vote polled of 450,906, 98,404, or about 14 times as many of the voters in proportion were unable to read or write. In Italy, where the Roman Catholics had 51 archbishops, 223 bishops, 55,263 churches and chapels, 76,560 parish priests and 28,991 religious persons to help enlighten the people, no less than 53.89 per cent. of the males and 72.93 per cent. of the females were, in the year 1881, unable to read and write. In Spain, where Roman Catholicism is the established religion, and Protestants dare not proclaim a church service, where there were in 1884, 32,435 priests, 14,592 nuns, 78,564 churches, and 1,684 monks, 30.64 per cent. of the males and 41.37 per cent. of the females were not even able to read when the census was taken in 1887. In Portugal and its islands, where the state religion is Roman Catholicism, and the Protestants do not exceed 500 in number, the number of illiterate inhabitants in 1878 was 3,751,774, or 82 per cent. of the total population, including children. All the above figures, and many more of like interest, may be found in the Statesman's Year-Book of 1892, and cannot be successfully challenged. What has just been said about illiteracy in Quebec and in the Roman Catholic parishes in Manitoba need not be repeated.

The Greatest Reasons.

But there are even greater reasons for the existence of national schools. It is necessary for the good of Canada and her people that her children should grow up together in her schools. As Canadians they must have common aspirations and common sympathies. The friendships of the

youth of Canada must not be limited by race nor creed. Canadians must not be separated in the schools to become estranged through after life. Every true Canadian must desire to throw down all barriers, whether of race or of religion, which can have but the one effect of dividing our countrymen into two separate peoples not only without sympathy for one another but, by a life-long training, saturated with antipathies and antagonisms. Who is there who will not resolutely set his face against separate schools and all other agencies so destructive to common citizenship and the public good? Who can refuse, or even refrain from, joining in the fight for state rights, equal rights, and a system of education in every sense national?

VIII.

The Situation.

The Supreme Court of Canada has decided that Roman Catholics cannot be taxed to support our public schools as at present constituted. Following upon this decision the Judges of the Full Court of Manitoba have held that Episcopalians also are exempt from taxation for public school purposes. As the Presbyterians conducted denominational schools here previous to the union, they too must be exempt if the judgments already delivered are correct. The result is, that, if we are to have public schools in Manitoba, we must raise all our revenue for school purposes from taxes levied upon Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists and a few others. In a recent decision Mr. Justice Killam intimated that though Roman Catholics, Episcopalians and Presbyterians could not be taxed to support the public schools, they have a right under the Act to attend them at the expense of the Methodists, Baptists and Congregationalists. In other words if the decision of the Supreme Court in the Barrett case, and of the Full Court in the Logan case are sustained by the Privy Council, a system of public schools in Manitoba is rendered absolutely impossible.

Either the whole public school system will have to be demolished to make way for private schools in connection with all the churches, or some arrangement must be made by which the Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists and a few others may unite and tax themselves to support a weak and one sided system, to which Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians cannot be required to contribute. It will, therefore, be seen that the fight is not only against separate schools, but for the very existence of our public school system, Manitoba's chief blessing.

The Fight Is Just Begun.

But even should the decision of the Supreme Court be overthrown and that of our own Courts in the Barrett case sustained, the fight for national schools will not end there.

Although there are some persons foolish enough or dishonest enough to represent that because the school question is now before the Judicial Committee, it is therefore out of politics, few are sufficiently shallow to be led away by such an argument. Anyone familiar with the struggles that have taken place in other provinces must know that Manitoba's battles on the school question have just begun.

A Foul Insult.

It is only a few weeks since the *Northwest Review*, the organ of Archbishop Tache, and of the Roman Catholic Church in this Province, declared that our public schools "ignore religion and God," and used the following disgracefully vile language with reference to them :—

"What is the end and aim of nineteen out of every twenty young men reared in the public schools ? The Dollar, and it alone, his instruction has taught him to be almighty ; an Almighty God he knows nothing of. It is corrupting whole armies of the young women of our present generation, orphan asylums and foundling and Magdalin institutions are being filled." Who ever penned a more stupendous and insulting lie than this ? Do not the statistics of all countries and peoples show that the opposite is the case, and that we have to look to countries where Roman Catholicism is supreme for unlimited crime and unbridled licentiousness ? But foul and abominable though the falsehood be, it seems to show how determined the unscrupulous opponents of national schools are to preserve what Mr. Luxton so properly called the "nurseries of the Roman Catholic Church." The battles yet to be fought will be as fierce as, if not fiercer than, any that have gone before. If the people of Manitoba should not resolutely support the hands of the present Government against which the hatred of the Roman Catholic Church is now directed, if the existing administration should be returned by an English speaking majority so narrow that the members from the French Roman Catholic constituencies would hold the balance of power, what would be the result ?

A Hypocritical Opposition.

It is true that the Oppositionists in conventien assembled have declared against separate schools, but did not all the Opposition members, eleven in number, oppose the third reading of the bill on the 19th March, 1890 ? Is it to be imagined that they would hesitate, if it were possible to attain office by selling national schools for the support of the French Roman Catholic members ? No course has proved too dishonorable for the present recognized leaders of the Opposition, and by resorting to the political gutter for some recent alliances they have made themselves even more to be watched and shunned. But besides traitors at home, there are other dangers which have yet to be encountered. Quebec has yet to be reckoned with, and when Quebec speaks, Ottawa is not without ears. The British North America Act, section 93, sub-section (3), provides that :—

" When in any Province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the Province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education." The same provision is reproduced with modifications, as sub-section (2) of section 22 of the Manitoba Act as follows : " An appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from an Act or decision of the Legislature of the Province, or of any Provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education." A third sub-section, like sub-section (4) of the 93rd section of the British North America Act, provides for the enactment by the Parliament of Canada, so far as may be necessary, of laws requisite to the carrying out of the decision on such appeal. Even if the Judicial Committee should decide that the Public School Act does not affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools possessed by the Roman Catholics prior to the union, what is to prevent the Dominion Government holding on an appeal that they have

a right to their denominational schools as established since the union ? What is to prevent Parliament from passing laws to force such a system on this Province under its powers to pass remedical legislation ? To return the Provincial Government by a decreased majority would be to invite this very interference which we have every reason to dread. Quebec is on the alert and will spare neither effort nor expense to destroy opposition to the favorite project of her priesthood. When Quebec is vigilant and determined, Manitoba must not be weak. The fight which has been entered upon must be fought with a united front and unfaltering resolution to the end. The school question is still the supreme issue before the electors of the Province, and upon it the Government is entitled to the support of every lover of freedom, every opponent of priestly interference in the management of Provincial affairs. Is Manitoba to be controlled from the Vatican, or by her own people ? Every vote cast against the present Government is on the side of Popery and the reactionary scheming of a foreign priesthood.

APPENDIX A.

Sample Separate School Education.

To demonstrate the utter uselessness of the teaching iven in the Roman Catholic separate schools in this Provnce under the old system, the following translation of an examination paper set for first-class Roman Catholic teachers in 1885 is appended :—

Catholic Section of the Board of Education—Examination of Teachers.

First-Class Certificate.

Examiners { Rev. J. Messier, Priest.
M. J. Prendergast, Barrister.

Catechism—

1. What is the Church ? Where is the true Church ? Ought one to believe what the Catholic Church teaches us ? And why ?

2. What is the Eucharist? What is it necessary to do to receive with benefit this great sacrament ?

3. What is sanctifying grace ? How is it lost ?

4. Name and define the theological virtues.

Comportment—

1. How is a letter addressed, when written, to a prelate, to a priest, to a professional man ? How are such letters concluded ?

2. In conversation, what titles do you employ in speaking to these same persons ?

History—

1. Describe the defeat of the American armies near Chateauguay ?

2. Who was Saint Thomas Becket? What difficulty had he with Henry II? How did he die? What was the fate of Marie Stuart? Write a short note on the treaty of Paris. Who was then Governor of Canada?

GEOGRAPHY—

What is the capital of England? Name its principal cities. Where is Egypt situated? What is the object of geology? What is terrain d' alluvion, terrain de sédiment?

PEDAGOGY—

Demonstrate the importance of developing judgment among children. How can that faculty be exercised?

The original of the above paper and of several others even more absurd will be found in the "Memoire" prepared by the Catholic section of the Board of Education and sent to the Colonial Exhibition at London, in 1886.

APPENDIX B.

The Religious Exercises in the Public Schools.

To refute the statement sometimes made, that the national schools of this Province are "godless," it is only necessary to call attention to the regulations of the Advisory Board regarding religious exercises in the Public Schools. These regulations were adopted May 21st, 1890, after the passage of the Public School Act, and are as follows:

"Until further notice, the Religious Exercises in the Public Schools shall be:—

(*a*) The reading, without note or comment, of the following selections from the Authorized English Version of the Bible or the Douay Version of the Bible.

(*b*) The use of the following forms of prayer.

Scripture Readings.

Part 1.—Historical.

1. The Creation.....Gen. i, 1—19
2. The Creation—continued.....Gen. i, 20—31
3. The Fall of Man.....Gen. iii,
4. The Deluge.....Gen. viii, 1—22
5. The Covenant with Noah.....Gen. ix, 1—17
6. The Trial of Abraham.....Gen. xxii, 1—18
7. Isaac Blesses Jacob.....Gen. xxvii, 1—29
8. Esau's Blessing.....Gen. xxvii, 30—45
9. Jacob's Vision.....Gen. xxviii, 10—22
10. Jacob's Return to Bethel.....Gen. xxxv, 1—15
11. Joseph and his Brethren.....Gen. xxxvii, 1—22
12. Joseph Sold into Egypt.....Gen. xxxvii, 23—36

13. Pharaoh's Dreams.....Gen. xli, 1—24
14. Joseph's Interpretations.....Gen. xli, 25—43
15. Jacob's Sons' Visit.....Gen xlii, 1—20
16. Jacob's Sons' Return from Egypt.....Gen. xlii, 21—38
17. The Second Visit to Egypt.....Gen. xliii, 1—14
18. Joseph and his Brethren.....Gen. xliii, 15—34
19. Joseph and his Brethren—continued.....Gen. xliv, 1—13
20. Joseph and his Brethren—continued.....Gen. xliv, 14—34
21. Joseph Discovers Himself to his Brethren.....Gen. xlv,
22. Jacob and his Household go into Egypt.....Gen. xlvi, 1—6, 28—34
23. Jacob's interview with Pharaoh.....Gen. xlvii, 1—12
24. Death of Jacob.....Gen. xlviii, 1—21
25. Burial of Jacob.....Gen. 1, 1—26
26. Moses at the Burning Bush.....Exod. iii, 1—20
27. Grievous Oppression of the Hebrews.....Exod. v,
28. The Passover.....Exod. xii, 1—20
29. The Israelites Escape Through the Red Sea.....Exod. xiv, 10—31
30. The Song of Deliverance.....Exod. xv, 1—22
31. Giving of Manna.....Exod. xvi, 2—35
32. The Water from the Rock.....Exod. xvii,
33. The Ten Commandments.....Exod. xx, 1—17
34. The Covenant with Israel.....Exod. xxiv,
35. The Tabernacle.....Exod. xl, 17—36
36. Spies sent into Canaan.....Num. xiii, 17—33
37. The People Rebel at the Report of the Spies.....Num. xiv, 1—30
38. The Song of Moses.....Deut. xxxii, 1—14
39. The Death of Moses.....Deut. xxxiv,
40. Joshua Succeeds Moses.....Josh. i, 1—17
41. The Covenant witl Joshua.....Josh. xxiv, 1—28
42. The Call of Samuel.....1 Saml. iii,
43. The Israelites Desire a King.....Saml. viii, 1—20
44. Samuel Anoints Saul.....Saml. ix, 21—27, xi, 1—11
45. Samuel Anoints David.....Saml. xvi,
46. David and Goliath.....Saml. xvii, 1—27
47. David Overcomes Goliath.....Saml. xvii, 28—54
48. David and Jonathan.....Saml. xviii, 1—16
49. David Instructed as to the building of the Temple..
I Chron. xvii, 1—17

50. David's Advice to Solomon.....I Chron. xxviii, 1—20
51. David's Preparation for Building the Temple..I Chron. xxix, 1—19
52. Solomon's Wise Choice.....I Kings iii, 1—15
53. Preparations for Building the Temple.....I Kings v,
54. Solomon's Prayer at the Dedication of the Temple..
II Chron. vi, 1—21
55. Solomon's Prayer—continued.....II Chron. vi, 22—42
56. Elijah.....I Kings xvii,
57. Elijah and the Prophets of Baal.....I Kings xviii, 1—21
58. Discomfiture of the Prophets of Baal.....I Kings xviii, 22—46
59. Elijah in the Wilderness.....I King xix, 1—13
60. Elijah and Elisha.....II Kings ii, 1—15
61. Naaman the Leper.....II Kings v, 1—19
62. The Fall of Israel.....II Kings xvii, 6—24
63. Public Worship of God Restored.....II Chron. xxix, 20—36
64. Deliverance under Hezekiah.....II Kings xix, 1—19
65. Deliverance under Hezekiah—continued.....II Kings xix, 20—36
66. Rejoicing of the Israelites at the Restoration of
Divine Worship.....II Chron. xxx,
67. Jerusalem Taken by Nebuchadnezzar.....II Chron. xxxvi, 5—21
68. The Golden Image.....Dan. iii, 1—18
69. The Fiery Furnace.....Dan. iii, 19—30
70. Daniel in the Lions' Den.....Dan. vi,
71. The Temple Rebuilt.....Ezra i, 1—6 & iii,

Part 2.—The Gospels.

1. Christ the Word.....John i, 1—18
2. The Birth of Christ Announced.....Luke ii, 8—20
3. The Visit of the Magi.....Matth. ii, 1—12
4. The Song of Simeon.....Luke ii, 25—40
5. Jesus in the Temple.....Luke ii, 41—52
6. The Baptism of Jesus Christ.....Matth. iii, 1—17
7. The Temptation of Our Lord.....Luke iv, 1—15
8. Testimony of John the Baptist.....John i, 19—34
9. The First Disciples.....John i, 35—51
10. Jesus at Nazareth.....Luke iv, 16—32
11. At Capernaum.....Matth. iv, 13—25

12. Sermon on the Mount.....Matth. v, 1—12
13. Sermon on the Mount—continued.....Matth. v, 13—20, 33—37
14. Sermon on the Mount—continued.....Matth. v, 38—48
15. Sermon on the Mount—continued.....Matth. vi, 1—18
16. Sermon on the Mount—continued.....Matth. vi, 19—34
17. Sermon on the Mount—continued.....Matth. vii, 1—14
18. Sermon on the Mount—continued.....Matth. vii, 15—29
19. The Miraculous Draught of Fishes.....Luke v, 1—15
20. The Healing of the Paralytic.....Luke v, 16—26
21. The Twelve Apostles Sent forth.....Matth. ix, 36—38, x, 1—11
22. The Centurion's Servant—The Widow's Son.....Luke vii, 1—17
23. The Declaration Concerning John.....Matth. xi, 2—19
24. The Feast in Simeon's House.....Luke vii, 36—50
25. Privileges and Responsibility.....Matth. ix, 20—31
26. The Sabbath.....Luke vi, 1—11
27. Parable of the Sower.....Mark iv, 1—20
28. Parable of the Tares, etc.....Matth. xiii, 24—35
29. Parable of the Tares Explained, with other Parables..
Matth. xiii, 36—52
30. Children brought to Jesus—Conditions of Discipleship..
Mark x, 13—30
31. Tribute to Cæsar—The Widow's Offering.....
Matth. xxii, 15—22, Mark xii, 41—44
32. Christ Confessed..... Matth. xvi, 13—28
33. Christ Feeding Five Thousand.....Mark vi, 30—41
34. Christ Walking on the Sea.....Matth. xiv, 22—33
35. The Transfiguration.....Matth. xvii, 1—13
36. The Great Supper.....Luke xiv, 7—24
37. The Lost Sheep and Lost Piece of Silver.....Luke xv, 1—10
38. The Two Sons.....Luke xv, 11—32
39. The Pharisee and the Publican.....Luke xviii, 9—17
40. Blind Bartimeus-Zaccheus the Publican.....
Luke xviii, 35—43, xix, 1—10
41. The Good Samaritan.....Luke x, 25—37
42. The Good Shepherd.....John x, 1—18
43. Christ One with the Father.....John x, 22—42
44. Humility.....John xiii, 1—17
45. The Death of Lazarus.....John xi, 30—48

46. The Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem....Mark xi, 1—11, Matth. xxi, 9—16
47. Parable of the Ten Virgins.....Matth. xxv, 1—13
48. Parable of the Talents.....Matth. xxv, 14—30
49. The Judgment.....Matth. xxv, 31—46
50. Christ Comforts the Disciples.....John xiv, 1—14
51. The Holy Spirit Promised.....John xiv, 15—31
52. Christ the True Vine.....John xv, 1—17
53. Last Sayings of Jesus.....John xvi, 1—15, 26—33
54. The Prayer of Christ.....John xvii, 1—26
55. The Box of Precious Ointment.....Matth. xxvi, 1—13
56. The Last Supper.....Matth. xxvi, 17—29
57. The Agony in the Garden—Betrayal of Jesus....Matth. xxvi, 30—56
58. Christ before Caiaphas and Peter's Denial.....Matth. xxvi, 57—75
59. Christ Before Pilate.....Matth. xxvii, 1—25
60. The Crucifixion.....Matth. xxvii, 26—43
61. The Crucifixion—continued.....Luke xxiii, 39—56
62. The Resurrection.....Mark xvi, 1—7, John xx, 3—18
63. The Journey to Emmaus.....Luke xxiv, 13—35
64. Jesus appears to His Disciples—the Doubt of Thomas.. John xx, 19—29
65. Jesus appears again to His Disciples.....John xxi, 1—23
66. The Ascension.....Matth. xxviii.

Form of Prayer.

Most merciful God, we yield Thee our humble and hearty thanks for Thy fatherly care and preservation of us this day, and for the progress which Thou hast enabled us to make in useful learning; we pray Thee to imprint upon our minds whatever good instructions we have received, and to bless them to the advancement of our temporal and eternal welfare; and pardon, we implore Thee, all that Thou hast seen amiss in our thoughts, words, and actions. May Thy good Providence still guide and keep us during the approaching interval of rest and relaxation, so that we may be prepared to enter on the duties of the morrow with renewed vigor both of body and mind; and preserve us we beseech Thee, now and forever, both outwardly in our bodies and

inwardly in our souls, for the sake of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. *Amen.*

Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven, give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. *Amen.*

The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. *Amen.*